

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/655,684	09/05/2003	Makarand P. Gore	200311300-1	6500
75	90 06/02/2006		EXAM	INER
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY			HESS, BRUCE H	
P.O. Box 27240	lectual Property Administration Box 272400 ART UNIT PAPER		PAPER NUMBER	
Fort Collins, C	O 80527-2400		1774	
			DATE MAILED: 06/02/2000	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				4	
		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
		10/655,684	GORE, MAKARAND P.		
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
		Bruce H. Hess	1774		
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
Period fo	• •	(IO OFT TO EVOIDE MON		· · · · ·	
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAY INSIDE OF THE MAILING	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication (D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status		. /	CI		
1)🔀	Responsive to communication(s) filed on _9 -	5-03(IDS) and	5-18-08 IDN		
		action is non-final.			
3)[Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matters, pro	osecution as to the merits is		
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.		
Disposit	ion of Claims				
4)[X]	Claim(s) 1-44is/are pending in the application	n.			
1/1	4a) Of the above claim(s) 10 11 s/are withdraw	wn from consideration.			
5)[_					
6)🛛	Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) is/are rejected.		• ,		
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.	•			
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.		•	
Applicat	ion Papers				
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
,—	Applicant may not request that any objection to the				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d	i).	
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.		
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
•	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	.)-(d) or (f).		
•	All b) Some * c) None of:	F	, , , , ,		
,	1. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received.			
	2. Certified copies of the priority document		ion No		
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio	rity documents have been receiv	ed in this National Stage		
	application from the International Burea	u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).			
* (See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	∍d.		
Attachmer	• •	🗖 .	(TTO 1/10)		
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D			
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/3B/08) ar No(s)/Mail Date		Patent Application (PTO-152)		

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05)

The restriction/election requirement of the prior Office action is adhered to and made final for the reasons of record.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 USC 112 (2) as being indefinite for the reasons set forth below;

A. If not admixed, what is the meaning of "in thermal contact" in the context of a composition claim ?; and

B. Since a composition does not have layers, the stabilizer cannot be "overprinted".

Claims 1-4 and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the patent to Morgan (USP 6,632,584: see column 8, lines 19, 20 and 43 and column 9, lines 11, 12 and 53).

Claims 1-3 and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the patent to Ramsden et al. (USP 6,514,677: see column 21, line 4; column 43, line33; and column 36, lines 8 and 9).

These patents both teach color forming compositions comprising a leuco dye, an infrared absorber (i.e., chroman) and a stabilizer (i.e., a croconium dye in Morgan). The experimental modification of this prior art inn order to ascertain optimum operating conditions (e.g., determine the infrared radiation wavelength), fails to render applicant's claims patentable in absence of unexpected results.

BRUCE H. HESS PRIMARY EXAMMENT GROUP 1200

Buce Hey